EXHIBIT D

Part 2 of 2

to

Declaration of Andrew Prins

1	mismatch. So we're only looking at very distinct
2	mismatches. We're not looking if they have the same
3	last name or the same first name or Bill or Wil or
4	those types of things. We're trying to eliminate and
5	be conservative about that. So we get a clear
6	mismatch in the name. So it really does indicate
7	with a high degree of confidence that the wrong
8	number was called.
9	Q. I'm sorry. I have to unpack that a little
10	bit.
11	A. Okay.
12	Q. Let's say that Time Warner Cable called its
13	customer on January 1st, 2017. Okay? And its
14	customer was Bob Smith. That's what it says on the
15	call log. We called Bob Smith, January 1st, 2017.
16	And then let's say we called the customer again on
17	March 15th, 2018. We still think it's Bob Smith.
18	I believe what you were saying is that
19	through Lexus Nexus, if Bob Smith had relinquished
20	his phone at some time between January 1st, 2017 and
21	March 15th, 2018, Lexus Nexus would tell us there's a
22	different customary user associated with the phone at
23	the time of the March 15 call; right?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And would Bob Smith still be reported in

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder Conducted on December 18, 2018

Lexus Nexus as a customary user of the phone, or would the new owner be reported as the customary user of the phone?

A. You can do ranges of dates and request data of certain periods of time. The issue here is, when did -- the actual person that was called after the number was relinquished by Bob Smith, when did that person start getting called, and you look up that date with that phone number. And if on that date the first time that person was called, that was the wrong number, shows up as a different person, then you know there was a wrong number called.

Perhaps if you went before the date that the person was originally called, which is not really a part of this case because they wouldn't have received a call, so there would be no action. Sometime before that, you'll get a hit on Bob Smith or the new person or even somebody in between and the number could have been relinquished three times. So the idea is that you put the phone number in with the date, the first date the call was made, to a putative class member that is potentially a wrong number call and see if that mismatches from the account information.

Q. Just to be clear. So let's go back to our March 15, 2018 call. We thought we were calling Bob

87

1	Smith, but we know that it was actually Jane Howard
2	that had the phone at that time. Okay? Would
3	Lexus if we gave it the March 15 date or the phone
4	number, would it tell us that Jane Howard was the
5	customary user of the phone at that time and would
6	Jane Howard be the only customary user at that time?
7	A. Yes. And not just only. It just matters if
8	it was a different user. And if the phone number was
9	associated and was used by a person after Bob Smith
10	relinquished it, a wrong number call was made.
11	Q. And how does Lexus know that Bob Smith
12	relinquished it?
13	A. They don't. They'll have previous data for
14	previous dates, if you request it, that's associated
15	with Bob Smith.
16	Q. Uh-huh.
17	A. And at some later date, it's associated with
18	another person. So you can again, if it was
19	required and I don't think it is but if you
20	wanted to do a lookup through Lexus Nexus and provide
21	the last time Bob Smith was called accurately, and

the next time a call was attempted to him, which was

a year later, and it was a different person, you'll

associated with them. And you know that something

get two pieces of data and you'll get dates

22

23

24

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder Conducted on December 18, 2018

happened with that number, between the original accountholder and the user of that number and the wrong number that was called. So you know that the number changed hands at some point.

- Q. So I think you acknowledged earlier that it's possible, although perhaps rare, that there would be multiple users associated with a phone number of Lexus at a particular time; is that right?
- A. That's right. But if you -- again, if you request that data from Lexus Nexus, you'll get multiple hits with multiple names. And if one -- let's say he comes back with five pieces of data and one of them is actually the accountholder on that date, but there is other names associated with that number, too, we eliminate that from the class. We just say he's not a class member, because it looks like there were multiple users of the phone and one was the accountholder, we're actually trying to call the accountholder, and that was legitimate.

So that's the idea, is that we look for true mismatches that are a mismatch across the board. If you get a hit that's a similar name to an accountholder, we eliminate that from the class.

Q. Do you know whether cable companies provide underlying data sources to services like Lexus Nexus

	TT	TT	
and	Tra	nUni	on

A. Um, I know that those data processors advertise that -- or claim or assert, that one of their sources of data is utilities. So the extent that a cable service can be considered a utility, just like electric or water, I believe that they can obtain some of that data, if not all of it.

And I don't -- I'm not an expert in the privacy laws of individual states and all that stuff, of how much data can be obtained that isn't an intrusion on some privacy regulation. But I know that they advertise utilities, and, you know, a cable company may be, one of them, or may not be.

Q. Are you aware of -- strike that.

Do you know whether Lexus has the ability to determine who actually answered a particular phone call?

- A. No. There's no way to know that unless there's eye witnesses or a recording or something like that, of the person physically in realtime answering the phone call. There's no --
 - Q. It's just impossible --
- A. There's no independent observation of that, no. But my understanding, also, is that, you know, wrong number calls aren't predicated upon who

answered. It depends on whether you called the wrong number or not.

- Q. Do you know whether Mr. Weir took any steps to clean or manipulate the data that was provided by the defendant, or would that be a question for Mr. Weir?
- A. It would be a better question for him. I don't have his declaration in front of me. I can only attest to the methodology I'm familiar with and what he's testified to and -- when I've just worked with him in the past anecdotally. But certainly those kind of questions are more appropriate for him.
- Q. So I believe you testified that your methodology, as executed by Mr. Weir, accounts for variations in name. Was that right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you tell me how it does that?
- A. Yeah, he uses a couple of different software products. I don't know the names offhand, but he can testify to that. That like this similarity scoring among data, that give you a probability of a match or mismatch.
- So, for instance, if you run a lot of data through the software, it may result and kick out

 10 percent of the data as being a mismatch or being a

1	A. A lot of this looks like it mimics the call
2	log records that were produced and that he's added
3	additional information to those call logs based on
4	his analysis. So I don't some of them are easy.
5	Obviously, these calls are outbound collection calls,
6	so they are outbound calls. That's what that means.
7	You have columns like "File ID" and "UC ID,"
8	those are internal designations that I don't know
9	what they mean.
10	Q. Do you know what the column, "Result ID,"
11	means? That's Column L.
12	A. Thank you.
13	I don't offhand, without looking at the
14	other evidence again.
15	Q. Do you know what that column, "Duplicate
16	Checks," means? That's Column O.
17	A. No. Those values don't make sense to me
18	under duplicate checks.
19	Q. Do you know what "Call Date" means in Column
20	P?
21	A. Yeah. My understanding is that's the date
22	the call was made.
23	Q. Do you know what "Date first" means in
24	Column Q?
25	A. That's probably account record information

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

96 1 from the first date of -- or when that account was 2 established. With Time Warner Cable? 3 0. 4 Α. With Time Warner Cable. Do you know what Column R, "Match," means? 5 0. 6 Α. I think that's -- that might be --7 match, match. I don't know what all of these columns 8 specifically are, but it's probably -- that's 9 something Colin put together to see if there was a 10 match or not in -- when he looked up the number so 11 that a match would mean it's not part of the class, I 12 think, in this case. 13 But I'm not sure. You'd have to ask him about each individual column and the details of it. 14 Do you know what "Straight mismatch," that's 15 0. 16 Column S is? 17 Α. No. 18 Q. Do you know what "Maxmatch first," is, Column T? 19 20 A. No. 21 Do you know what "Max mismatch first," Q. 22 Column U is? 23 Α. No. 24 "Date mismatch," Column V? Q.

25

No.

Α.

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

1	Q. "Call mismatch," Column W?
2	A. No.
3	Q. "Total mismatch," Column X?
4	A. No.
5	Q. "First AM," Column Y?
6	A. No.
7	Q. How about "Single call," Column Z?
8	A. No. Again, this is, you know, his analysis,
9	and I opine on the methodology and I looked at his
10	summary results in his report, but the individual
11	internal details of everything is really in his value
12	book. It's not something I analyzed.
13	MR. PRINS: Sorry for boring you, Josh.
14	BY MR. PRINS:
15	Q. I'd like to go back to the name-matching
16	process that Mr. Weir used. Are you familiar I'm
17	you did not review the parameters and you don't know
18	the particular program he used, but are you familiar
19	generally with the sorts of inconsistencies that he
20	would have determined result in a match versus a
21	nonmatch?
22	A. Generally he gives examples of that in his
23	report.
24	Q. And what is your understanding of what he
25	did?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

98

Again, issues like Bob versus Robert in a A. name or Bill versus William, or determining if first names were the same, but maybe a maiden name changed to a married name.

And my understanding is -- and I would always recommend this in using this methodology -that you be very conservative. So even if it even looks close like that -- and that's why I use the software because it gives you a probability score of whether multiple pieces of data match. So that's the type of -- those are examples he gives, I believe.

- So the maiden name ones, would that be a situation where, you know, our call log record might say we were calling Jane Smith but Lexus is reporting the customer user is Jane Howard?
- And maybe it has the same address, also, as A. the account. So then you have a pretty good indication that that person was the actual right person that was called.
- 0. Just so I understand. So if Lexus is reporting that the user, the customer user of the phone, has the same address as our customer's address, you think it's pretty likely we were calling the right person?
 - Generally, yes. That's one of the pieces of Α.

1	number call.
2	And looking at this Exhibit 3, do you see
3	where it says customer name is .
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And do you see where it says the call date
6	is 12/29/2016?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. If on March 5th, 2017, somebody by the name
9	of walked in to Bank of America and
10	opened an account with the phone number
11	which you see identified in Column F; correct?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Would you agree that it's likely that this
14	was not a wrong number call?
15	A. Well, there is other data in here. And
16	again, I am not an expert in his analysis and how he
17	labeled everything, but Column U says, "Max mismatch
18	first."
19	It appears to me that the number changed
20	possibly in 2014. So any call after that date would
21	have been a wrong-number call, regardless of if
22	somebody accidently used somebody else's phone number
23	at some point in time.
24	Q. So let me give you some clear assumptions
25	just so that we're on the same page. So just assume

can always think up. But that's not what his statistical analysis is based on and that's not what this analysis is based on.

And I think, even if we get this right, a very large -- most of the time in the vast majority of the cases that we're looking for for the class members, if we miss one or capture one that shouldn't be in there, again, it's not my understanding it's a requirement that this has to be a hundred percent accurate without one anomalous piece of data.

- Q. What percentage accuracy do you think your methodology has produced?
- A. All I could say is a vast. I mean, I don't know an exact percentage. And all I can tell you is that, testifying in the past and being involved in class action cases with many, many more records than are here, that, given the same answers and the understanding that these hypothetical anomalous situations, anybody can make up, there's certainly no evidence for those things, however, nothing is a hundred percent perfect. Absolutely nothing. And my understanding is that this doesn't have to be.
- Q. If your methodology was 90 percent accurate, would you still consider it a reliable methodology?
 - A. Yes. I would consider reliable if it's over

1 50 percent, but in my experience it's more than that. 2 Q. So an error rate, your methodology would 3 still be reliable, in your view, if its error rate 4 was 50 percent? 5 Well, I shouldn't say it so flippantly like 6 that. My experience has been that this is somewhere 7 between 90 and a hundred percent. I have seen testimony in other cases, not by Colin but from other 8 9 people that do his work, of a 93 to 95 percent 10 accuracy rate in getting the correct data. 11 The fact that there's 4 or 5 percent, and we 12 can think of these bizarre hypothetical situations 13 that are included in that 4 or 5 percent, it doesn't 14 impact my opinion at all. 15 So those are the numbers that I've seen 16 testified to using this methodology. The same 17 methodology is used across the industry. So I don't 18 know what the court accepts as reliable or not, 19 that's for them to decide. But my experience has 20 been with the data analysts that do -- that actually 21 perform this work, they claim a very, very high 22 percentage of accuracy. You've opined in this case that the 23 0. 24 methodology is accurate; correct?

25

A.

Yes.

1	Q. And what I'm asking you, sir, is what is
2	your threshold for reliability?
3	A. I don't have a specific statistic. However,
4	in my appearance, I have seen this methodology
5	testified to in written testimony, depositions and
6	trial that this is well above 90 percent accurate.
7	Again, the fact that we can come up with
8	hypothetical situations, it has not been my
9	experience that those unrealistic hypothetical
10	situations make up the majority of this data. The
11	fact that you could find a mistake or two, doesn't
12	change my opinion on the reliability.
13	Q. Understanding that a mistake or two doesn't
14	change your impact about its reliability, that's not
15	the question I'm asking, sir. The question I'm
16	asking is, you have testified that this methodology
17	is reliable. And what is your criteria for
18	determining reliability?
19	MR. ARISHON: Objection. Asked and
20	answered.
21	THE WITNESS: Experience with this method.
22	The fact that it's been deemed reliable by courts
23	around the country. I don't have a particular
24	statistic in mind. And I don't know that you could
25	actually get a very good statistic unless you queried

1	the class action administrators themselves, over 90
2	percent accurate.
3	Again, just because we can think of a
4	hypothetical in one circumstance where this
5	methodology doesn't work, that that somehow means
6	that it doesn't work for everybody or that that's
7	kind of the majority or that's the norm, no, that's
8	not what I'm saying. This methodology is going to
9	capture the great majority of truly wrong-number
10	calls. I'm convinced of that.
11	BY MR. PRINS:
12	Q. But you can't put a number on what that
13	means?
14	A. No. But the fact that I can't put a
15	statistical number on it, it doesn't change the fact
16	that this works to my opinion, and it's been
17	empirically shown to be true. We're not making this
18	stuff up out of nowhere. This is a methodology
19	that's been used for many years in many class
20	actions, and it's been empirically shown to be true
21	and accepted by the courts.
22	MR. ARISHON: Is this a good time for a
23	break?
24	MR. PRINS: What are you guys thinking in
25	terms of food?

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

1	Q. And what's the title of that table?
2	A. "Illustrative Examples of the Matching
3	Process."
4	Q. And could you tell me what the header "Call
5	Date" means to you?
6	
1000	A. That appears to be the date in the call log
7	records that a prerecorded call was made from Time
8	Warner.
9	Q. And what about the field telephone number?
10	A. That appears to be the telephone number that
11	was called.
12	Q. And what about the header, "TWC Customer
13	Name"?
14	A. That is the account holder's name for Time
15	Warner.
16	Q. And what is Lexis customer name?
17	A. That is the customer name they got back from
18	Lexus Nexus.
19	Q. In other words, the customary user of the
20	phone?
21	A. Yes, based on data they requested, they got
22	a name back for that telephone number.
23	Q. And what does Lexus first seen date mean in
24	the next column over?
25	A. I'm not sure of that. That may be the first

1	time or the first piece of data that Lexus collected
2	regarding this phone number.
3	Q. But you're not sure.
4	A. I'm not sure.
5	Q. We would have to talk to Mr. Weir about
6	that?
7	A. Yes. This is his report; so he can speak to
8	that in much more detail than I can.
9	Q. What does the header "Match" mean?
10	A. Whether we considered in the methodology a
11	name that was obtained from Lexus Nexus as a data
12	processer matched or reasonably matched the
13	accountholder's name such that it was not a
14	wrong-number call.
15	Q. So if a match is equal to yes, according to
16	the methodology, it was not a wrong-number call; is
17	that correct?
18	A. Correct.
19	Q. And if the match is a no, according to the
20	methodology, it is a wrong-number call; is that
21	correct?
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And just looking through this table, the
24	first row, it has TW customer name, ,
25	Lexus customer name and a match yes.

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

125

Conducted on December 18, 2018

1 And that means that this was a right-number call to 2 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. And that second row has a call date of 5 January 12th, 2017, we have a TWC customer name of 6 , a Lexus customer name of 7 and a match of yes. Did I read that 8 correct? 9 Α. Yes. 10 And that means, according to the 11 methodology, this was a correct-number call. 12 Correct? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Next line, May 11th, 2018, we have a another Q. 15 TWC customer entry of , but this time, 16 Lexus customer name is showing up as 17 is that right? 18 Α. Yes. 19 0. And we have a match of no. What is this 20 line telling us? 21 That the call that was made intended for Α. 22 on May 11th, 2018, actually went to 23 , who now had that number. And the 24 first time that this information appeared in Lexus 25 Nexus's data was in February 2017. So apparently, at

1	person on May 11th, 2018, well over a year later, but
2	the data shows that sometime between January 12th,
3	2017 and February 6th, 2017, no longer
4	used that number and now it using that
5	number, and therefore, it was a wrong-number call.
6	Q. So at the time of this May 11th, 2018 call,
7	was no longer associated with this
8	phone number. Is that a fair statement?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And then on the next line we have this
11	December 4th, 2014 call to . That's
12	the TWC customer name. Did I read that correctly?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And then we have a Lexus customer name of
15	and a Lexus first seen date of
16	January 1, 1994, and a match set to yes. Did I read
17	all that correctly?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And what is that row telling us?
20	A. That's saying at the time they made the
21	call, the accountholder that was a customer user of
22	that number was still the customer user of that
23	number.
24	Q. And going down to the next row, we have a
25	call date of February 8th, 2018, a TCW name of

1	O And do you agree that thege are illustrative
1000	Q. And do you agree that these are illustrative
2	examples of the methodology you have proposed and
3	Colin Weir has implemented?
4	A. Well, this is Colin Weir's wording. I take
5	his wording at face value. It says, "Illustrative
6	examples." So it must be illustrative examples,
7	that's not an opinion of mine. And, yeah, this is
8	using the technology the methodology and the
9	technology I described in my report.
10	Q. Have you reviewed the Lexus data underlying
11	this table 1?
12	A. No.
13	Q. In fact, I believe you testified earlier
14	that you were haven't reviewed any Lexus data in
15	connection with this case, correct?
16	A. That's right. It was Colin Weir's task.
17	I'm only opining on the overall methodology.
18	Q. Have you ever reviewed the output data from
19	the Lexus Nexus product that Mr. Weir used in any
20	case?
21	A. Again, and you asked me that earlier today.
22	No.
23	Q. Let's circle back to the third row,
24	and . Do you know if Mr. Weir
25	has done anything to confirm whether or not there was

1	people.
2	BY MR. PRINS:
3	Q. Other than considering situations where the
4	last name of the TWC customer and the Lexus customer
5	are the same, does the methodology do anything else
6	to account for whether or not the TWC customer name
7	and the Lexus customer name are married?
8	A. Are married? No. It accounts for
9	misspellings, again, nicknames for formal names,
10	those types of things. There's no way to tell the
11	relationship.
12	But what I can tell you, if
13	was called, it was a different person than
14	regardless of their relationship, and the
15	wrong number was called, the wrong person that is not
16	the accountholder, was called. It was the wrong
17	number. They had the right number, wrong person.
18	That's what a wrong number is.
19	Q. And that would be true even if this said
20	instead of ; right?
21	A. That may well be true, and for us, again, to
22	be conservative, we're not including that in the
23	class.
24	Q. Do you know if Mr. Weir discarded any of the
25	results that were returned by Lexus?

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

4	To an it was to an it was to be a second to an
1	A. I can't I can't I don't know anything
2	about Mr. Weir except what he wrote in this report;
3	so I can't guess. I can't testify about what he did
4	or didn't do.
5	Q. Can you please pull back up Exhibit 1, which
6	is your report in this matter; is that correct?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. I'd like you to turn to paragraph 14. It's
9	on page 5. Are you there?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And the first sentence reads:
12	"In my experience, call logs obtained from
13	IBR systems that include thorough details of each
14	outbound call made, such as in this case, are highly
15	reliable and accurate."
16	Is that correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And you stand by that opinion today?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. And so there's a couple of compound words in
21	this sentence; so I just want to be clear. Are you
22	opining that IBR records in general are highly
23	reliable and accurate, that both records in general
24	and Time Warner's records are highly reliable and
25	accurate, or that just Time Warner's records are

-	
1	highly reliable and accurate or something else?
2	MR. ARISHON: Object to form.
3	THE WITNESS: In my experience, I have never
4	seen call log records or call detail records that are
5	logged in software, into a database, after the call
6	processing is performed and the duration of the call
7	is over, a inaccurate recording of that data. I've
8	never seen that ever.
9	I don't is it possible that something
10	bizarre happens somewhere, again, a weird
11	hypothetical of one in a bizillion chance? Yeah, I
12	can't testify to everything at all. But I'm
13	convinced that the call log data is accurate in this
14	case and overall with dialing systems and interactive
15	voice responses.
16	BY MR. PRINS:
17	Q. Just to be clear. It's your testimony that
18	the IBR logs that you have reviewed in this case are
19	highly reliable and accurate; correct?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. What is the basis for that opinion?
22	A. As I just explained, the call recording and
23	the information about the call is logged in a
24	database after the communications event occurs and
25	after it's finished. So all the data about that call

1	programmed to listen to the prompts of the dual-tone,		
2	multifrequency buttons on your phone to determine		
3	what to do with the call. So press 1 to talk to a		
4	customer representative. Press 2 for billing		
5	information, et cetera. So it's interactive in that		
6	sense and it can be tied to other computer systems.		
7	But the point is that it's an automated		
8	system that's designed to, when an outbound call is		
9	initiated, to be played, a recording to be played, or		
10	when an inbound call comes in, the computer answers		
11	the call with the voice system.		
12	Q. And do you know, is there one company that		
13	makes the IVR or are there many companies that make		
14	IVRs, or how does that work?		
15	A. Many. There is many, many.		
16	Q. How many manufacturers of IVRs would you say		
17	there are in your experience?		
18	A. I don't know. Dozens and dozens.		
19	Q. And what IVR software does Time Warner Cable		
20	use?		
21	A. I don't know.		
22	Q. Have you inspected the IVR platform that		
23	Time Warner uses?		
24	A. No.		
25	Q. Do you know how the IVR system that Time		

somebody says hello?

- A. Before. And also before someone says hello or knows the phone is ringing, the call is blocked, and therefore, you don't get an alert from your phone that a call came in.
- Q. And so why would -- if that happened, if in this case we called and the call was blocked before somebody said hello, why would Charter's IVR think that was a live voice?
- A. Oh, it could be many reasons. It could be that it's programmed specifically for call blocking, such that you know that when it receives a signal that there was an intent to hang up and it was blocked based on the call-blocking software, it simply left. It was programmed to this leave this disposition in that situation.

Certainly, if a call is completed and there's nothing else involved in the call, even if you just manually dialed somebody and they had call-blocking software, it would probably be recorded as live voice. That's just the default. There's no assumption here that anything else answers besides a person, and this is computer systems and software that determine whether it's an answering machine or fax tones or those types of things.

160

1 So the kind of call analysis that goes on 2 is, it believes it's a live voice, but when it's 3 instantly hung up or it's instantly blocked, it has 4 no other indications. 5 I mean, this is most likely what happens in 6 The issue is that even if the attempt 7 status said answering machine, there would be a zero 8 duration of the call. So it really doesn't matter 9 which indication it puts here in this case, the call 10 was answered and nothing else happened after it was 11 Then the call was terminated instantly. answered. 12 And do you know how Time Warner Cable's IVR is configured to deal with call-blocking 13 14 applications? 15 Α. Based on this hard evidence here, it's 16 designed to leave a live voice attempt status 17 probably with a call duration of zero. 18 Q. But you're not basing that opinion on 19 anything other than this Exhibit 5; right? 20 A. Unless you gave me a false exhibit of 21 erroneous data that you know is erroneous, this is 22 hard evidence that that is exactly how it's 23 programmed. 24 And because that blocked call would have Q.

been disconnected before anything else happened on

161

1 the phone, no artificial or prerecorded voice would 2 have played on that call; correct? 3 Α. That's right. 4 And do you know how often this happens in Q. 5 Charter's IVR records, where blocked calls are being 6 reported as live voice? 7 Α. No. 8 You haven't done anything to analyze that; 0. 9 correct? 10 Α. No. 11 Because you weren't asked to? 0. 12 Α. I wasn't asked to. And I leave it up to Colin Weir to do the analysis of the call records and 13 I assume he wasn't asked to either. 14 15 0. Is it your experience that IVR systems -- is 16 it typically one piece of software in the IVR system 17 or is it multiple pieces of software? 18 It replicated software. This is a realtime Α. 19 communication system and it's a one process, one 20 function. You can make multiple calls 21 simultaneously, play the same simultaneously over 22 multiple processes, or remote multiple -- depending 23 on if the system is a voice over IP system or it's a

traditional trunk lines and channels. These systems

are designed not to be single-threaded so it's one

24

December 18, 2018 162

1	call at a time doing one thing at what time, they'd
2	be very slow and inefficient.
3	So you can do multiple calls at a time, run
4	multiple campaigns at a time, leave different
5	messages under different campaigns, et cetera.
6	Q. Do you know whether Time Warner Cable's IVR
7	systems uses a traditional trunk configuration or a
8	voice over IP configuration?
9	A. No. It's really immaterial to the issue.
10	Q. Do you know whether Time Warner Cable has
11	used the same IVR software from today back through
12	2013?
13	A. No.
14	Q. Because you haven't
15	A. I haven't looked at that. But, again, this
16	is forensic evidence, and if the call records show an
17	IRV was used, I'm not sure if it matters which system
18	was used, if they swapped out a system or bought a
19	new one, et cetera. But the call logs clearly show
20	that an IVR was used to make these calls.
21	Q. Would you agree that the algorithms used for
22	detecting whether something is a live voice differ in
23	some respect between the various manufacturers of IVR
24	systems; correct?

25

A.

Yeah. Some advertise, you know, better than

1	producing erroneous data, but in my mind, this is all
2	very accurate. There's no reason to think it isn't.
3	Q. And you're basing that solely on your review
4	of David Zitko's deposition transcripts and your
5	general experience with IVR's; is that right?
6	A. Yeah, and 35 years of call processing,
7	understanding technology and expertise and knowledge,
8	yes. To tell me or to come up with some
9	hypothetical where what you presented me is a hundred
10	percent false and then have me come to the conclusion
11	that this is erroneous data, it's just silly to me.
12	I don't understand it.
13	Q. Are call dispositions usually recorded in a
14	database?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. What database software does Time Warner
17	Cable use?
18	A. It doesn't matter. Usually these dialing
19	systems have internal databases and they probably use
20	Microsoft SQL or Oracle. Those are the two most
21	popular, large databases, but there are others
22	around. The manufactured database software is
23	inconsequential to the fact that the data was stored
24	there and accurately reported on.

So you don't know what database software

25

Q.

Time Warner Cable uses?

- A. That's right. And it doesn't matter either.
- Q. How many pieces of software are involved in time warper Cable's IVR process between when the call is detected and the disposition is generated and when that is actually logged into a database?
- A. I have no idea. And I don't even know what a piece of software means. I could tell you what functions are in software and how they're developed and the processes that are run. Probably hundreds or thousands. But that's specific to the manufacturer of the software and proprietary.
- Q. And you have no idea what functions or software Time Warner Cable is using; correct?
 - A. From a functional standpoint, I know exactly what functions they are performing. They're using call progress analysis; they are using a database storage; they're using the automatic playing of prerecorded voice message based on program dispositions for a given campaign. I can tell you all kinds of functionality in the software.

Those other details of what function talks to what function at a low level of software, is irrelevant to my opinions of functionality here and that these records must be accurate.

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

1	A. No.
2	Q. Has the court ever criticized you for
3	opining on the technical configuration of a dialing
4	system without having analyzed it?
5	A. You mean inspected it?
6	Q. Inspected it.
7	A. Twice out of 300 cases.
8	Q. And were you disqualified in those cases?
9	A. No. I've had testimony stricken. Not
10	disqualified as an expert.
11	Q. In which cases did you have your testimony
12	stricken?
13	A. Leg versus Voice Media; Dominguez versus
14	Yahoo; and CBA versus Marshall.
15	Q. Is that the three cases?
16	A. Those are the three that I'm aware of. I
17	was on other cases where the court disagreed with my
18	opinion but didn't strike testimony. But I also have
19	dozens and dozens of court opinions that have said
20	the exact opposite or the same type of analysis.
21	Q. Other than reviewing Mr. Zitko's deposition
22	transcripts and relying on your general experience
23	with IVR systems, have you done anything else to
24	verify the accuracy of Time Warner Cable's IVR
25	records?

- A. No, but it would be -- I have no experience, ever, in the dozens of systems I've analyzed and all the analysis I've done over ten or 11 years on systems like this, that these records are not accurate. I guess someone can make that contention, but there is no evidence to that effect, and I'll stand by my opinions, that they are accurate.
- Q. Are you aware of situations where IVR platforms -- strike that.

Are you aware of situations where the call progress analysis function of an IVR platform gets confused about whether something is a live voice or a voicemail?

- A. No, but that doesn't mean it can't happen, and certainly it would be a software bug where something like that would occur. But that would occur over a period of years. Somebody would have discovered that bug and fixed it or done something. So over a period of many years and many calls were made, it's hard to fathom that the system is working improperly.
- Q. You don't know, sitting here today, how frequently Time Warner Cable's IVR records have dispositions that have been miscategorized as a voicemail when they were actually live voices, do

you?

- A. No, but if that did happen, there are still calls initiated with a prerecorded voice, regardless of whether they were answered by a live voice or a voicemail, and those are the ones we're counting.

 We're counting both of those. So even if they're confused, we're going to come up with the same total number.
- Q. And, likewise, sitting here today, you don't know how frequently it happens in Time Warner Cable's IVR logs, where something is recorded as a live voice when it was actually an answering machine, do you?
- A. That's right. But, again, let's assume they were all live voice or all answering machine, regardless of how that's all programmed to respond, in either case the call was initiated with a prerecorded voice and left a disposition based on an IVR being used. So even if the disposition code was wrong, it's basically saying an IVR was used and we used a prerecorded voice, please record everything as a live voice or record everything as an answering machine. The count will still be the same based on those calls to wrong numbers.
- Q. So your testimony is it doesn't matter whether something was really a live voice call or an

Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only Transcript of Randall Snyder

Conducted on December 18, 2018

184

0	Or	re	201	- 2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yes, I do.
- And is this the reason, this paragraph 22, 0. the reason why your methodology does not rely on any subpoenas to the cell phone carriers?
- That's right. And not just in a case like this, but in general. That is an arduous task to -there's about a hundred carriers, mobile carriers in the U.S., not including NBOs. We're talking about little rural carriers that have one cell site and things like that. To send a list of tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of telephone numbers to each one and have them perform an analysis of the subscriber data, is not feasible.

So the other thing is, if you don't do that, right, because again, even if you get subscription data direct from the carrier, for a family plan that has five phones on it, you only get one name. So you don't get the customer user of the phone number, right, which might be in a family plan, but not recorded from a business perspective from the carrier.

0. And that's because it's your understanding that, in the case of family plans, that the subscriber of the entire family plan is typically the

name associated with --

A. In some cases there are some carriers that request the name of the user, even in a family plan, so it's not that business relationship but they want to record that.

And that's also true also of a lot of prepaid carriers today, because prepaid phones, they can be used as burner phones. U.S. hasn't done it yet, but many countries have instituted for prepaying phones, that people come in and provide identification or information or they're going to cut off their service, so that it can't be used illegally. So it's more typical today to see prepaid carriers record information about the person buying the phone.

- Q. But some don't require it; correct?
- A. Some don't require it.
- Q. So it's your view that using the Lexus Nexus product that Mr. Weir was using, would provide more accurate results than subpoening the carrier?
- A. Yes. And that's especially because -- even -- let's say I have a prepaid phone number I've had for years and the carrier I'm using has no idea who I am, I just top it off every month in some amount of money. But if I applied for credit or get a bank

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	COUNTY OF CLARK)
4	I, Jane V. Efaw, CCR No. 601, do hereby certify:
5	That I reported the taking of the deposition of
6	the witness, RANDALL SNYDER, at the time and place
7	aforesaid;
8	That prior to being examined, the witness was by
9	me duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole
10	truth, and nothing but the truth;
11	That I thereafter transcribed my shorthand notes
12	into typewriting and that the typewritten transcript
13	of said deposition is a complete, true and accurate
14	transcription of said shorthand notes taken down at
15	said time, and that a request has been made to review
16	the transcript.
17	I further certify that I am not a relative or
18	employee of counsel of any party involved in said
19	action, nor a relative or employee of the parties
20	involved in said action, nor a person financially
21	interested in the action.
22	Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada, this 19th day of
23	December 2018.
24	De Eline
25	Jane V. Efaw, CCR #601